

In re Appln. of Savicki, Alan F.
Application No. 09/979,521

Remarks

Claims 1, 2, 6-12, 14-25, 29-35, 37-44, 48-67, and 71-83 remain in this case. The allowance of claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 12, 14-25, 29-35, 37-44, 48, 49, 54-67, and 72-27 is acknowledged and appreciated. In response to the Office Action dated June 4, 2003, applicant has amended claims 8, 50, 53, and 71. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments. Applicants believe that the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration in light of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 53, 80, 82, and 83 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,301,394 to Richardson et al. Claims 8-10, 50-52, 71, 76, 78, and 79 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,301,394 to Richardson et al. in view of U.S. Patent 3,583,041 to Horwitt. Claim 77 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,301,394 to Richardson et al. as applied to claim 50 and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,871,281 to Stolmeier et al. Claim 81 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,301,394 to Richardson et al. in view of U.S. Patent 5,871,281 to Stolmeier et al.

Applicant respectfully submits that there are substantial structural differences between the applied references and applicants' claimed invention. However, to expedite the prosecution of the subject matter that the Office Action indicates is allowable, applicants have amended claims 8, 50, and 71 in the form as originally presented such that they depend from the presently allowed claims 1, 43, and 66, respectively.

In particular, claim 8 has been represented in its original form such that it depends from previously amended and now allowed claim 1. Dependent claims 9 and 10 depend on amended claim 8 and, therefore, contain the same patentable features.

Claim has been represented in its original form such that it depends from previously amended and now allowed claim 43. Dependent claims 51, 52, 76, 77, 78, and 79 depend on amended claim 50 and, therefore, contain the same patentable features.

Claim 71 has been represented in its original form such that it depends from previously amended and now allowed claim 66.

In addition, claim 53 has been represented in its original form such that it depends from previously amended and now allowed claim 43. Dependent claims 54, 55, and 80-83 depend on amended claim 53 and, therefore, contain the same patentable features.

In re Appln. of Savicki, Alan F.
Application No. 09/979,521

Conclusion

The application is considered to be in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Thomas C. Feix, Reg. No. 34,592

The Glad Products Company
PO Box 24305
Oakland, CA 94623-1305
(510) 271-7416 (Telephone)
(510) 271-5652 (Facsimile)

Date: October 6, 2003

Attachment: Petition for One-Month Extension of Time

J:\PT\TCF\492.166\response to junc 4 2003 office action.doc

- 15 -

OFFICIAL

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

OCT 07 2003